ಗಳಿಗೂ ತಕರಾರುಗಳನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ವೈಮನಸ್ಯವನ್ನುಂಟುಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಅರ್ಹರಾದರೂ ಇರಲಿ, ಅಥವಾ ಇರ್ಹರಾದರೂ ಅಂತಿಕೊಂಡಿರಲಿ. ನನ್ನ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಚ್. ಪಾಟೀಲ್ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ತಕ್ಷಣ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಿಧಾನಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ.

PRIVILEGE MOTION *Re*: PURCHASE OF RAMA PRIYA BUILDING

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Sir, under Rule 177 and 178 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business of the Mysore Legislative Assembly, I hereby give notice of the following privilege motion :—

> "The question of purchase of Ramapriya Building from Eliah Maharaja was raised by way of a short notice question by Hon'ble Member Sri Rajiah Shetty on 12th March 1968 and also an half-an-hour discussion was raised on 5th April 1968. The Hon'ble Minister said Rs. 18 lakhs as the value of the building was fixed after the officers of the Public Works Department examined the building. I reliably learn which is true to the best of my knowledge and belief that the Chief Engineer concerned valued the building and estimated it at Rs. 13 lakhs. If this is so, this relevant fact is suppressed from the purview of this House by its non-disclosure and thereby the Hon'ble Minister committed a breach of privilege of this House. I am raising a specific issue in this notice—Did or did not the Chief Engineer estimate the value of the building at Rs. 13 lakhs and if so, why did the Government pay Rs. 5 lakhs more than the estimated value by negotiation ? Since the House is misled by the statements of the Hon'ble Minister, I move this question may be reffered to the privileges committee."

Sir, I wish to submit only a few facts about this question. This question was raised by Hon'ble the Leader of Opposition even as early as on 1st August 1967 while discussing the supplementary demands in this House. He stated as follows :— (ಪುಟ 204-205 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದ)

> "ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ವಿಚಾರ ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಯಾರೋ ಒಬ್ಬ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಶ್ರೀಮಂತರು, ಅವರು ಮಹಾರಾಜರು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು, ಅಂಥವರ ಒಂದು ಮನೆಯನ್ನು ಖರೀದಿಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊರಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಆಫೀಸುಗಳಿಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಜಾಗವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು-ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ರಸ್ತೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ತಿರುವಾಂಕೂರು ಮಹಾರಾಜರ ಅರಮನೆಯನ್ನು ಖರೀದಿಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊರಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಷ್ಟು ಹೊತ್ತಿಗೆ ಖರೀದಿ ಆಗಿದೆಯೋ ಏನೋ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. (At that time it was not, because it was disclosed the other day that the deal was finalised in December 1967). 18-20 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅದನ್ನು ಕೊಂಡುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಇದರ ಹಿಂದೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ವೈಕಿ ಒಬ್ಬಿಬ್ಬರು ಬಹಳವಾಗಿ ಸಹಾಯಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಒತ್ತಡವನ್ನು ತರುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಿದೆ. ಬಹುಶಃ ಮುಂದಿನ ವಧೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅದು ಬರಬಹುದು. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇಂಥ ಅನುಪಯುಕ್ತವಾದ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊರಟರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದ ಖಜಾನೆ ಖಾಲಿ ಆಗಬಹುದು. ಯಾರೋ ಮಹಾರಾಜರ ಪ್ರೇಮ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿದ್ದವೀರಪ್ಪ)

ಸಂಪಾದನೆಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಒಂದು ಬಂಗಲೆಗೆ ಏಕೆ 18–20 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಇನ್‌ವೆಸ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ ? ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಜಮೀನು ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟಿದೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ 20 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿ ನಾಲ್ಕೈದು ಅಂತಸ್ತುಗಳುಳ್ಳ ಕಟ್ಟಡವನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಬಹುದು.''

This is what was stated by the Hon'ble Leader of Opposition and this is reported on pages 204 and 205 in volume VI–3.

Then Sir, this question was again raised by my friend Sri Rajaiah Shetty by way of short notice question on 12th March 968. There the Hon'ble Minister stated, I will read only one relevant sentence and not more, as follows :

''ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎನ್. ನಂಜೇಗೌಡ.—ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಡಿಂಗ್ ಎಷ್ಟು ಬಾಳುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಇರಬಹುದೆಯವರನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಾ ? ಕೇಳಿದರೆ 3 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಬಾಳುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ? ಇದು ಇರುವುದು 5 ಎಕರೆ ವಿಸ್ತೀರ್ಣ ಜಲ್ಲವೇ ? ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಎಕರೆಗೆ 3 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಆದರೆ 15 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಆಗಲಿಲ್ಲವೇ ? ನಮ್ಮ ಮಹಾರಾಜರ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು 10 ಸಾವಿರದಿಂದ 15 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ವರೆಗೂ ನಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದವರೇ ಕೊಂಡುಕೊಂಡದ್ದು ನಿಜವಲ್ಲವೇ ? ಹಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ, ಇದನ್ನು ಎಕರೆಗೆ 3 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿನಂತೆ ಕೊಂಡುಕೊಳ್ಳಿದೇ ಇರುವುದರ ಔಚಿತ್ಯವೇನು ?

ಶ್ರೀ ವೀರೇಂದ್ರ ಪಾಟೀರ್.—ನಗೋಷಿಯೇಟ್ ಮಾಡಿಯೇ ಅವರ ಕಡೆಯಿಂದ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇದರ ಉಪಯೋಗ, ಉಪಯುಕ್ತತೆಯನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ.''

The specific question that was raised by the Hon'ble Member was, whether the department examined and estimated the value of this building ? Of course, no reply was given by the Hon'ble Minister, so far as that specific question is concerned.

Then Sir, during his reply to the half an hour discussion on Short Notice Question on 5th April 1968, this Hon'ble Minister stated :—

"18 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಾದರೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಎಲಯ ಮಹಾರಾಜರಿಂದ ಬಂದಿರುವ ಕಾಗದದಿಂದ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಿದೆ.

1965ರಿಂದಲೂ ಸಹ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಡಿಂಗನ್ನು 18 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಿಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ವಿಚಾರವಿದ್ದು 1967ನೇ ಡಿಸೆಂಬರ್ ತಿಂಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯವಾಗಿದೆ. 1967ನೇ ಡಿಸೆಂಬರ್ ತಿಂಗಳವರೆಗೂ ಸಹ ಎಲಯ ಮಹಾರಾಜರು ತಮ್ಮ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಡಿಂಗನ್ನು 18 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಿಗೂ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಅಂದರೆ 12 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅಥವಾ 16 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಯಾರೂ ನಮಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿಲ್ಲ. They had made up their mind to purchase it for 18 lakhs. ಕಡಿಮೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟಾ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನವನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾಗಿದೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ರಾಜಯ್ಯಶೆಟ್ಟರು ಚದುರಗಜ ಒಂದಕ್ಕೆ 110 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಂತೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ನಮ್ಮ ಚೀಫ್ ಇಂಜನಿಯರ್ ಅವರು ಚದುರಗಜ ಒಂದಕ್ಕೆ 50 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಂತೆ ಲೆಕ್ಕ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮುಂದೆ ಒಂದು ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಏನೆ ದರೂ ಎಲಯ ಮಹಾರಾಜರಿಗೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೂ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನೇರವಾಗಿ ಏನೂ ವ್ಯವಹಾರ ನಡೆದಿಲ್ಲ. 18 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಿಗೂ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಬೆಲೆಗೆ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಡಿಂಗನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆನ್ನುವ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಲೋಕೋಪಯೋಗಿ

ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಯವರನ್ನು ಎಲ್ಲು ಮಹಾರಾಜರಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಮಾತುಕತೆಯಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಳಿಸಿದ್ದೆವು. ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಯವರು ಹೋಗಿ ಬಂದು ಒಂದು ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

Then Sir, this is very important : what he said was :

"ಕಡಿಮಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಾಗ, ನಾವು ಇವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಡಿಸೆಂಬರ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಾರೆ 50 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಗಳಿಂತೆ ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ ಒಂದಕ್ಕೆ ನಿರ್ಣಯಮಾಡಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ."

So the fact really for consideration here is the Hon'ble Minister made us to understand on that day, when he gave his reply, that everything possible was done to safeguard the interest and also the finances of the State by sending the Secretary and also by getting it examined by the departmental officers. This particular point, *viz.*, the Chief Engineer inspected the spot and gave an estimate of the building, was not brought to the notice of this House. If only they had taken this point, *viz.*, the report of the Chief Engineer, which I have reason to believe, is fully true, he had estimated it at Rs. 13 lakhs, I do not know what weighted with the Government to raise it by 5 lakhs of rupees more, over and above what the Chief Engineer had estimated. I am not charging the individual Minister as such. I hold the entire Cabinet responsible, each one of the Ministers who is sitting here, as this is a matter which involves the entire cabinet. I know the rules of procedure of Cabinet. According to the Rules of Procedure, a note is prepared by the Cabinet Secretary. All relevant matters that would enable the Ministers to come to their independent opinion while going through the cabinet papers, are to be mentioned, in the note.

3-00 P.M.

I would like to know from them whether in the Cabinet report that was given to them this fact namely, the Chief Engineer valued it and Rs. 13 lakhs was mentioned : if so, what weighed with them in raising it to Rs. 18 lakhs, if the report was to the effect that it was only Rs. 13 lakhs. Sir, this is a matter in which I personally feel that what I am stating is true. That is why I am requesting you to get the file examined and see whether what I stated is true or not. The concerned Chief Engineer—I do not know his name—went there and made a value of it and he estimated it and gave a report to the Government that its value is only Rs. 13 lakhs. Therefore, Sir, I feel that in this particular case, the Government has misled this House and it involved a breach of privilege. Any Government worth the name should never misled the House because there are any number of decided cases on that point. The most important is that of Profuma case. We all know what Profuma case is which happened in the year 1963. The privilege of this House is that no Minister should utter a word of untruth,—I do not say lie—either wittingly of unwittingly because we are a sovereign body and as a sovereign body we are entitled to know the full facts of the case. I do not mind the Minister saying that they had valued it at Rs. 13 lakhs and for some reason he is giving Rs. 18 lakhs. Of course, if it was right,

(SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA)

we could have agreed. Now in this case, what has happened is we know the contractor, and he comes from a respectable family. He is related to our late Dewan Mr. Krishna Rao. This Maharaja has paid him Rs. 2 lakhs for the construction of the building. He has paid only Rs. 1 lakh for the site. He has paid only Rs. 3 lakhs and not more. Even granting for all the appreciation of the value during this period, it shall never go to more than Rs. 12 lakhs or all the most Rs. 13 lakhs. I think the Chief Engineer's estimate was correct even if you take the appreciated value of this building. I therefore feel that this Government has not exercised that amount of care and caution in safeguarding the interest of the State and they have committed a breach of privilege. I need not enter into details of the Profuma case. I therefore feel you need not enter into further discussion so far as this is concerned. If you come to the conclusion that what I said is governed by the rules in Chapter 20, then requirements are given under rule 179. Rule 179 clearly says :

> "The right to raise a question of privilege shall be governed by the following conditions, namely :—
>
> (i) not more than one question shall be raised at the same sitting ;
>
> (ii) the question shall be restricted to a specific matter of recent occurrence ;
>
> (iii) the matter requires the intervention of the Assembly."

My question is, here is a case where public money is involved, where in a private deal and negotiation, according to me, they have given more value than what the building deserves. I therefore feel that all these three requirements are to be satisfied. If you feel what I am stating is satisfactory to you, you have to ask us whether there is the requisite number of gentlemen on this side or that side of the House who would give the necessary consent. I therefore humbly appeal to you in the interest of the purity of public administration that this shall be referred to the Privileges Committee. I repeat it once again that I have no charge against any individual Minister. I have a charge against the entire Cabinet, that these gentlemen, as a team, have failed to safeguard the interest of the State.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I will hear the concerned Minister on Saturday and then give my ruling.

SRI K. H. PATIL—There is no provision to hear the concerned Minister. When the matter has been read over before this House...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I want to hear the other party also.

SRI K. H. PATIL—When the consent is given, he has already read out the motion. Now you have to take our consent. If the requisite number is there, then you have to hear the other party. So, you have

to put Mr. Siddaveerappa's motion and ascertain whether we support it or not.

† Sri M. NAGAPPA (Raichur).—I rise on a point of order. Just now, the Hon'ble Speaker has stated that the matter will be considered after hearing the Hon'ble Minister concerned. I think it is quite against the provisions laid down under Chapter 20 of the Rules of Procedure because it is very clear that the Hon'ble Member who has moved the motion has been called by the Hon'ble Deputy Speaker to state some of the facts pertaining to the case and accordingly, he has stated the entire facts on the floor of the House. Now the matter has been taken cognizance of by this House. This House is only competent and we have come up to rule 180 of the rules of Procedure. It means that the Hon'ble Speaker has given consent. Now, he has to ascertain whether there is requisite number of members in favour of this motion. If there is no objection, definitely, it will be taken that the matter has been referred to the Privileges Committee. Under rule 177, consent of the Speaker is required. What does that consent mean?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Let the Member be brief. In order to hold whether the motion is in order or not, there is nothing wrong in hearing the other side also.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—There is no question of hearing. This House or the Hon'ble Speaker is not competent to decide whether it amounts to breach of privilege or not. There is the Committee for that. That committee is competent to hold an enquiry and take evidence and decide the matter and report the matter to this House. Then of course, we will have an opportunity to discuss on that report. But we cannot say whether there is *prima facie* case or not and it should be discussed on the floor of this House. All these things will not come under Chapter 20.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The member will go through rule 180. I have stated that I will give the ruling after hearing the other side.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—It seems the Hon'ble Chair has not understood me properly. My point is this: now the Hon'ble Speaker is not in a position to say that he has not given his consent. I take it that consent has been given already now. Now you have gone up to the rule 180.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—First of all, I have to hold whether it is a *prima facie* case or not and whether the motion is in order or not.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—That stage has been passed already. I submit that under rule 177 the word 'consent' is there. It does not mean that he should hear everything and then give a ruling. That is not the meaning of the word 'consent'. It has been decided in several cases. I will quote Basu's commentary on Constitution, Volume II, pages 164 and 614 and 615. Before bringing the question on the floor of the House, the member should bring the matter to the notice of the Speaker

(SRI M. NAGAPPA)

privately. That means he has to move a motion and give notice privately to the Hon'ble Speaker. Then the Speaker will give an opportunity to raise the question on the floor of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—If the Hon'ble Member reads rule 180, he will understand.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—I am giving authorities in support of my argument.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—It is clear that there is no need to spend any time on this.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Secondly there is one book namely '*Functions of Speaker*' by Philip Lonte, wherein the powers and discretion of the Speaker have been discussed. In that it is said :

> "The Speaker's function is not to judge the case itself, but only to examine whether it conforms with the conditions and see whether it is fit to take precedence over all other business of the House."

So in respect of the matter of privilege, as it has been laid down under Rule 179, the Hon'ble Speaker has got the right to see whether the motion tabled satisfies certain conditions laid down. If these three conditions are fulfilled, definitely the Member who has tabled the motion will have a right to raise the matter on the floor of the House as laid down under rule 180.

> "180 (1) : The Speaker, if he gives consent under rule 177 and holds that the matter proposed to be discussed is in order, shall, after the questions and before the list of business is entered upon, call the member concerned, who shall rise in his place and while asking for leave to raise the question of privilege make a short statement relevant thereto :"

I have already explained what exactly Consent means. The matter has been seized by this House. It has come to the congnisance of this House. Rule 180 (2) says :

> "If objection to leave being granted is taken, the Speaker shall request those members who are in favour of leave being granted to rise in their places and if not less than ten members rise accordingly, the Speaker shall intimate that leave is granted."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—In this particular case, there are some allegations made against this particular Member. There is nothing wrong in hearing the other side before coming to the conclusion.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—It is definitely wrong, Sir.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH (Mudigere).—No allegation is made in this.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—In Parliamentary Procedure in India, page 420 it is said :

> "It must not be taken that because he (Speaker) ruled that there was a *prima facie* case, there was substance in it, it merely meant that he followed the prescribed rules."

So the Hon'ble Speaker has no right to hear the Minister whether there is substance or not. The question of substance cannot be decided at this stage. The question of substance would be decided by the privileges committee. The Hon'ble Speaker must admit if only it satisfies the three conditions laid down. I will submit so many cases.

1. House of Commons debate 1948-49 Vol. 468-Col. 1521. The same thing has been discussed. There also it was stated that the subject matter of the motion should not be looked into. Only the procedure laid down has to be followed.
2. House of Commons debate 1956-57-Vol. 563-col. 49 and 50.
3. House of Commons Debate 1951-52-vol. 499. col. 892.
4. Our Parliamentary debates-1958-col. 2.
5. Parliamentary debate 1959-vol. 7-8 pages 119-121.

In all these cases, it has been decided that the Speaker is not concerned with the subject matter of the motion. He has only to see that these conditions are fulfilled as laid down in rule 179. If they are complied with then the Member has a right to raise the matter on the floor of the House. It is now for the House to see whether there is the required number of persons behind the motion. If that is there, then the motion will be referred to the Privileges Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I have already said that this matter will be on Saturday. Now the Demand is before the House.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಹುಚ್ಚಮಾಸ್ತಿಗೌಡ (ಹುಲಿಯೂರುದುರ್ಗ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಉದ್ದೇಶವೇ ಅದು—ಅಂದರೆ ಈ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟಮೇಲೆ ಹಾಲ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಏನೇನು ಕಾರ್ಯ ಕ್ರಮ ಗಳಿವೆಯೋ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕಿ ತಾವು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರೈಮಾಫೇಸಿಯ ಕೇಸ್ ಇದೆಯೇ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಯಲು ಕೂಡಲೇ ಇದರ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಈ ದಿವಸ ಇಲ್ಲ ಈ ಸಭೆ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾಗುವ ಮುನ್ನವೇ ಈ ಪ್ರಿವಿಲೇಜ್ ಮೋಷನ್ನನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ನಮ್ಮ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ. ನಾವು ಅದನ್ನು ಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಈ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಒಂದು ಇಂಥಾ ಆರೋಪನೆ ಇದೆಯೇ ಅಥವಾ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಾವು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಡಿಂಗ್ಸ್‌ನ್ನು ತರಿಸಿ ಪರಾಂಬರಿಸಬಹುದು. ತಾವು ಆ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಡಿಂಗ್ಸ್‌ನ್ನು ತರಿಸಿ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರೈಮಾಫೇಸಿಯ ಕೇಸ್ ಇದೆಯೇ ಅಥವಾ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರೈಮಾಫೇಸಿಯ ಕೇಸಿದ್ದರೆ ಕೂಡಲೇ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಅಷ್ಟು ಏನಾ ಇದನ್ನು ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಆರ್ಡ್ಜರ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ತಾವು ಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟವರನ್ನು ಕರೆಸಿ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಆ ಒಂದು ಉದ್ದೇಶಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಇದರ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದೂಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದಾಗಲೀ ಅಥವಾ ಆರ್ಡ್ಜರ್ ಮಾಡ ಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯಾಗಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲ ಈಗ ಉದ್ಭವಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ಈಗಲೇ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳ ಬೇಕು. ಅದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ತಾವು ಇದನ್ನು ತಮಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾದಾಗ ಅಥವಾ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಹುಚ್ಚಮಾಸ್ತಿಗೌಡ)

ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟವರಿಲ್ಲ, ಅವರೂ ಬರಲಿ, ಅವರನ್ನೂ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡೋಣ ಅನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾನೂನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾವು ಇದನ್ನು ಈ ದಿವಸ ೪ ಗಂಟೆಗಳ ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿಯೇ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರ ಉದ್ದೇಶವಾದರೂ ಏನು ? ಇದನ್ನು ಈ ದಿವಸನೇ ಡಿಬೇಟ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಅನ್ನುವ ಉದ್ದೇಶವಿಂದತಾನೆ ! ಅದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಇದನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಈಗಲೇ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು, ತಾವು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri B. P. GANGADHAR.—I have a point of order, Sir. Every one of us is aware that the privilege motion tabled by Sri H. Siddaveerappa is followed by a short speech.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I have already stated that I would give my ruling on this on Saturday. The member is again repeating the same.

†Sri B. P. GANGADHAR.—Please turn to Rule 180. It says :

"(1) : The Speaker, if he gives consent under 177 and holds that the matter proposed to be discussed is in order, shall, after the questions and before the list of business is entered upon, call the member concerned, who shall rise in his place and while asking for leave to raise the quuestion of privilege make a short statement relevant thereto :"

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—There is no need to explain. I have understood everything. I have already said that I will give my ruling on Saturday. The matters is already disposed of.

Sri B. P. GANGADHAR.—I am raising a different point altogether. If you go on gagging my mouth I can't do anything. Kindly bear with me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The demands are before us. I would like to inform hon'ble members that under rule 164 I will apply guillotine and put all the demands to vote on the 15th instant. That is the last day allotted for demands. I am saying that this point has been already disposed of and again the Member is re-opening it and trying to waste the time of the House.

Sri B. P. GANGADHAR.—I have been raising a different point.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—There is no point of order.

Sri B. P. GANGADHAR.—I must first explain what is the point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The matter has been already disposed of and now there is no point of order.

Sri B. P. GANGADHAR.—Give me an opportunity to explain my point. When I honestly believe it is a point of order, I feel it is the duty of the Speaker to hear me. After hearing me, if he comes to the conclusion that there is no point of order he can say there is no point of order, but before hearing me if he says that there is no point of order, I am helpless.

Now we have come to the stage of the "short statement relevant thereto has to be made." That short statement has been already made by Sri Siddaveerappa. Next comes the proviso :

> "Provided that where the Speaker has refused his consent under rule 177 or is of opinion that the matter proposed to be discussed in not in order, he may, if he thinks it necessary, read the notice of question of privilege and state that he refuses consent or holds that the notice of question of privilege is not in order :"

Now you have not stated that the proviso is not applicable.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I have not come to a conclusion.

Sri B. P. GANGADHAR.—Then comes the next proviso :

> "Provided further that the Speaker may, if he is satisfied about the urgency of the matter, allow a question of privilege to be raised at any time during the course of a sitting after the disposal of questions.
>
> "If objection to leave being granted is taken the Speaker shall request those members who are in favour of leave being granted to raise in their places and if not less than ten members rise accordingly, the Speaker shall intimate that leave is granted. If less than ten members rise, the Speaker shall inform the member that he has not the leave of the Assembly."

So the only thing that is now to be done by the Speaker is that the Speaker has to ask whether the motion has the support of 10 members who should stand in their seats. When that point is decided the next clause comes in.

Further, Sir, you are under the impression that when a privilege motion is tabled a notice has to be caused to be issued to the other side. You are saying on the question of the privilege motion against the Chief Minister that since the Chief Minister is not here you will have to issue a notice to him and ask him and then only take it up. I say it is absolutely unnecessary. The rules do not contemplate the issue of any notice. The Speaker has only to satisfy that the required number of members support the motion by standing in their seats and then soon after that he has to refer the question to the Privileges Committee which is a statutory body which will discuss and decide the question. I submit that this is clearly a privilege matter and no time can be granted for issuing notice to the other side. It must have to be taken up immediately under rule 180.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The hon'ble member Sri Gangadhar has raised a point of order and read all the rules under Chapter XX. There is no point of order in it. The Chair has already stated that it would give a ruling on Saturday.

(*Several members rose immediately on points of order.*)

The House will now stand adjourned for half an hour.

The House rose at Thirty Minutes past Three of the Clock to re-assemble at Four of the Clock.

The House re-assembled at Five Minutes past Four of the Clock.

[Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair]

Sri K. H. PATIL.—Sir, you just advised me that the matter raised by me will be taken up on Saturday. Unfortunately on that day I will not be here as I will have to go to Delhi on an urgent matter. So, some other hon'ble Member of this House may be permitted to raise that point.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Instead of Saturday, you may please take that business on Monday as most of the Members will be away on Saturday.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I will take up both on Monday.

Sri G. CHANDRAKANTH (Bidar).—Hon'ble Deputy Speaker Sir, yesterday I had raised a point of privilege.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—We have issued a notice to the Editor of that Urdu Daily. We have taken action.

Sri G. CHANDRAKANTH.—That means it has been admitted ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—No. We have only issued a notice. The preliminary is done. Mr. Jawalaniah to speak.

BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR 1968-69—DEMANDS FOR GRANTS

DEMAND NOS. 15 AND 53

(*Debate contd.*)

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಬಿ. ಜ್ವಾಲನಯ್ಯ (ಹಾನಗಲ್). —ನನ್ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಈ ದಿವಸ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮುಂಡಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಎರಡು ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡ್‌ಗಳ ಒಟ್ಟು ಮೊತ್ತವಾದ 32,14 28,200 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ನಾನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಕೆಲವು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳ ಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಮೊದಲಿಗೆ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯದ ಇರಾಖೆಗೂ ಆಹಾರದ ಇರಾಖೆಗೂ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಸಂಪರ್ಕವಿದೆ ಎಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಕಳೆದ 20 ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಈ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಕೋಟ್ಯಾಂತರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಆಹಾರ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯ